

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amtd. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are amended by inserting "MD-CD" in place of "X-Y." Support for the amendment can be found on page 3, line 30 to page 4, line 1, page 12, lines 4-13, and Figures 1, 3, 4, and 5.

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are further amended by inserting "distinct" following "said discrete region has a." Support for the amendment can be found on page 8, lines 24-31 and Figs. 1-4.

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are further amended by changing "an" following "with respect to" to "a" to be grammatically correct.

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are further amended by inserting "and" following "linear orientation."

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are further amended by deleting all references to "X-Y."

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are further amended by deleting "defining" following "linear orientation."

Claim 14 is further amended by inserting "said first layer relatively hydrophobic relative to said second layer." Support for the amendment can be found on page 8, lines 1-2.

The Applicants believe these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Over Provost

Claims 1 3-5, 8, 12, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Provost and Shepard (US 2004/0157036), hereinafter referred to as Provost. Independent

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

Claims 1, 14, and 15 are amended to claim discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Claim 14 is further amended to claim the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to said second layer.

Claim 1 and Claims Dependent Thereon

The Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Provost under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 1 of the present application. The portions of Provost cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. The needle punched web of Provost is comprised of a carrier film 14 and batt 10 of fibers 12. Provost, Paragraph [0093] and Figure 1. In Provost, the batt 10 of fibers 12 is needle punched through the carrier film 14. Figure 2D of Provost shows a final structure of the batt 10 of fibers 12 and their relationship to the carrier film 14. As shown in Fig. 2D of Provost, the fibers 12 form loops protruding through the carrier film 14. Paragraph [0099] of Provost describes the loops as being "a plurality of individual loops 40 extending from a common trunk 42 trapped in film hole 38." Paragraph [0007] of Provost describes the forked needle 34 that creates the hole as having a diameter of 35 gauge or smaller. Thus, the needle 34 has a circular cross section orthogonal to the length of the needle above the forked portion of the needle. Other needle diameters are disclosed in Paragraphs [0038] and [0039] of Provost.

As shown in Fig. 2C of Provost, at one stage in formation of the looped web, the needle penetrates the carrier film 14 such that the entire forked portion of the needle is driven through the carrier film 14. Provost, Paragraph [0097], describes the carrier film 14 as having a thickness of about 0.05 mm. Provost, Paragraph [0099] describes the needle as having a total penetration depth "DP" between 2 and 5 mm. Cross sections shown in Figs. 2C and 2D of Provost show that hole in the carrier film 14 bounds the entire circumference of the needle 34 as the needle is punched through the film carrier. Since the needle 34 has a circular cross section, the hole 38 in the film carrier should also be circular. Thus, each trunk 42 should have a circular cross section as the web material comprising the trunk 42 protrudes through a circular hole 38 (as measured in a plane parallel to the plane of the unaltered web).

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amndt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

The discrete regions (or loops 40) in Provost do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. As discussed above, each trunk 42 has a circular cross section because the web material comprising the trunk protrudes through a circular hole 38. Figures 2D, 3D, 4, 7, 8, and 11 of Provost illustrate the structure of the web in profile. The loops 40 of Provost do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Rather, the loops 40 appear to look like trees or bushes extending from the trunk 42 and are symmetric in the MD-CD plane of the structure in Provost. As shown in Figure 11 of Provost, each set of loops 40 extending from each trunk 42 is spaced apart from the other. Paragraph [0105] of Provost states that “[p]referably there is sufficient distance between adjacent structures so as to enable good penetration of the field of formations by a field of mating male fastener elements.” As shown in Figs. 7 and 11 of Provost, each trunk 42 and corresponding loops 40 are spaced apart from other trunks 42 and loops 40. Therefore, loops 40 do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane, as claimed in the present application.

Based on the above, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Provost be withdrawn.

Because Claims 3-5 and 8, and 12 depend upon Claim 1, the Applicants submit that Claims 3-5 and 8, and 12 are also allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 3-5 and 8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Provost be withdrawn.

Claim 14

The Applicants submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Provost under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 14 of the present application. Provost discloses a looped fastener product. The looped fastener product of Provost is not a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article as claimed in Claim 14 of the present application.

Furthermore, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1, Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

Finally, Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 14 is allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Provost under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 15 of the present application. Provost discloses a looped fastener product. The looped fastener product of Provost is not an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article, as claimed in Claim 15 of the present application.

Furthermore, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1, Provost, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Provost. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Over Tranfield

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 12, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Tranfield (US 3,684,284). Independent Claims 1, 14, and 15 are amended to claim discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Claim 14 is further amended to claim the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to said second layer.

Claim 1 and Claims Dependent Thereon

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Tranfield (US 3,684,284). The Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Tranfield, as cited in the Final Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), because Tranfield does not disclose every element of Claim 1 of the present application. The portions of Tranfield cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

The loops in Tranfield, as cited in the Final Office Action, do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Tranfield, Column 3, Lines 46-51, describes the finished fabric as having a "random orientation of the fibers in the pile surface coupled with a high portion of fibers disposed substantially perpendicular to the pile surface penetrating through the layers composing the pile surface and the base structure." Randomly oriented fibers in the pile surface is inconsistent with the language of Claim 1 of the present application, in which the discrete regions have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Tranfield. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Because Claims 3, 6-9, and 12 depend upon Claim 1, the Applicants submit that Claims 3, 6-9, and 12 are also allowable over Tranfield. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 3, 6-9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 14

The Applicants submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Tranfield, as cited in the Final Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), because Tranfield does not disclose every element of Claim 14 of the present application. Claim 14 claims a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article. Tranfield discloses a cover for a tennis ball. The cover for a tennis ball in Tranfield is not a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article.

Furthermore, as discussed with respect to Claim 1 above and Tranfield, the portions of Tranfield cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Finally, Tranfield, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 14 is allowable over Tranfield. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Arndt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

The Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Tranfield under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) because Tranfield, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 15 of the present application. Claim 15 claims an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article. Tranfield discloses a cover for a tennis ball. The cover for a tennis ball in Tranfield is not an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article.

Furthermore, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1 and Tranfield, Tranfield, as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Tranfield. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Over Sorimachi et al.

Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sorimachi et al. (US 5,508,080). Independent Claims 1, 14, and 15 are amended to claim discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Claim 14 is further amended to claim the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to said second layer.

Claim 1 and Claims Dependent Thereon

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sorimachi et al. (US 5,508,080). The Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), because Sorimachi et al. does not disclose every element of Claim 1 of the present application. The portions of Sorimachi et al. cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

The discrete regions (protrusions 22a) in Sorimachi et al. do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Sorimachi et al., Column 4, Lines 32-37, states that needles used to create the structure have a diameter. Therefore, the needles in Sorimachi et al. have a circular cross section orthogonal to the length of the needle. As shown in Fig. 3 and described at Column 5, Lines 58-60, of Sorimachi et al.,

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

"part of the fibrous web 22 penetrates through the nonwoven fabric sheet 23 and forms protrusions 22a thereon." Since the needles in Sorimachi et al. are circular, the protrusions 22a should have a circular cross section when viewed from the side of the structure presenting the nonwoven fabric sheet 23 to the observer. Figures 3, 4, 6, 7, 8A, and 9A-C illustrate the structure of Sorimachi et al. in profile. The protrusions 22a of Sorimachi et al. do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Rather, each protrusion 22a appears to look like a bump with each bump being symmetric in the MD-CD plane. The cross section illustrated in Fig. 3 (and other figures in Sorimachi et al.) show that each protrusion 22a has the same cross section and the protrusions are spaced apart from one another. Therefore, protrusions 22a in Sorimachi et al. do not have a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Because Claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 13 depend upon Claim 1, the Applicants submit that Claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 13 are also allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 14

The Applicants submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Sorimachi et al. does not disclose every element of Claim 14 of the present application. Claim 14 claims a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article. Sorimachi et al. discloses a flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors. The flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors in Sorimachi et al. is not a topsheet for a disposable absorbent article.

Furthermore, as discussed with respect to Claim 1 above and Sorimachi et al., the portions of Sorimachi et al. cited in the Final Office Action do not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

Finally, Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose the first layer as being relatively hydrophobic compared to the second layer.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 14 is allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Sorimachi et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) because Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, does not disclose every element of Claim 15 of the present application. Claim 15 claims an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article. Sorimachi et al. discloses a flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors. The flexible laminated surface material for vehicle interiors and building interiors in Sorimachi et al. is not an absorbent core for a disposable absorbent article.

Furthermore, as discussed above, with respect to Claim 1 and Sorimachi et al., Sorimachi et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, does not appear to disclose discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Sorimachi et al. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sorimachi et al. in View of Kotek et al.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorimachi et al. (US 5,508,080) in view of Kotek et al. (US 6,120,718). Independent Claim 1 is amended to claim discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. The Applicants submit that Claim 11 is patentable over Sorimachi et al. in view of Kotek et al., as cited in the Final Office Action, because the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 11 of the present application. Claim 11 depends upon Claim 1. As discussed above, with respect to Claim 1 and Sorimachi et al., Sorimachi et al. does not appear to disclose a composite web having discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Kotek et al., as cited in the Final Office Action,

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

also does not teach or suggest discrete regions having a distinct linear orientation and a longitudinal axis in the MD-CD plane. Therefore, Sorimachi et al. in view of Kotek et al., fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 11 of the present application. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejections

As stated in the Reply After 1st Office Action filed December 22, 2005, Applicants agree to submit all necessary terminal disclaimers upon indication of allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1-15 are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10'737,235
Docket No. 9456
Amdt. dated 5/22/06
Customer No. 27752

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By



Signature

Roddy M. Bullock

Typed or Printed Name

Registration No. 37,290

(513) 634-0870

Date: May 22, 2006
Customer No. 27752

(5_22_06_Amendment-Response to Office Action_9456.doc) 1af
Revised 04/25/2006

Page 14 of 14